

REMARKS

The above-referenced application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's Office Action dated January 7, 2005. Claims 7-12 have been withdrawn, and Claims 14-18 and 20-24 have been amended. Accordingly, Claims 1-6 and 13-24 are currently pending in an active status. The Office Action includes a restriction requirement and indicates a shortened statutory period for reply of one (1) month. In addition to the restriction requirement, the Office Action objects to claim language, the abstract, and the drawings. Since the objections to the claim language, abstract and drawings address examination issues, Applicant respectfully submits that the shortened statutory period for reply should be three (3) months rather than one (1) month.

In accordance with the Office Action, the Examiner has restricted examination to one of two groups; Group I including Claims 1-6 and 13-24 directed to apparatus, and Group II including Claims 7-12 directed to methods. Applicant elects examination of Group I including Claims 1-6 and 13-24. Accordingly, Claims 7-12 are withdrawn from consideration.

In accordance with the Office Action, Claims 14-18 drew objections for the claim language "A unit array", which the Examiner suggests should be changed to "A CMOS image sensor". Claims 14-18 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

In accordance with the Office Action, Claims 20-24 drew objections for the claim language "A unit array", which the Examiner suggests should be changed to "A row decoder of a CMOS image sensor". Claims 20-24 have been amended to recite, *inter*

alia, "A row decoder". The prepositional phrase "of a CMOS image sensor" is deemed not to be required in these claims, which each depend from Claim 19 and necessarily include the elements and limitations thereof.

In accordance with the Office Action, the Abstract drew an objection for informalities. The Abstract has been amended to correct the informalities.

In accordance with the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that Figures 1-9 should be designated by a legend such as "Prior Art". Applicant provides proposed replacement Figures 1-9 herewith, each having the legend "Background". Although each of Figures 1-9 is either indicated in the specification as "conventional" and/or introduced in the Background section, it is uncertain whether either the whole or every detail of each drawing strictly constitutes prior art.

Applicant's intention in providing these drawings is to show the differences between implementations with and without particular inventive features for the purposes of explanation, without making any determination as to whether the drawings without the particular inventive features actually lack any inventive features whatsoever, as would be indicated by a legend such as "Prior Art". Since these drawings are introduced in the Background section of the specification and provide a background for the explanation of Applicant's currently claimed features, Applicant proposes the legend of "Background" to indicate that Figures 1-9 lack the currently elected features without prejudice towards any future inquiry as to whether they lack any other inventive features.

Conclusion

All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable consideration of this application on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Eric M. Parham
Registration No. 45,747
Attorney for Applicants

Correspondence Address:

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
Telephone: (516) 692-8888
Facsimile: (516) 692-8889